

**COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS, ENROLLMENT
AND REVENUE ADMINISTRATION**

December 11, 2001

5:30 PM

Chairman Hirschmann called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Hirschmann, Levasseur, Pinard, Thibault, Lopez

Messrs.: Kevin Clougherty, Sharon Wickens, Chief Kane

Chairman Hirschmann addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. Communication from Guy Beloin, Finance Analyst II, submitting monthly financial statements for the five months ended November 30, 2001.

Mr. Clougherty stated the report before you is the financials through the five months ended in November. It really projects the same pattern that we have been looking at with the Welfare budget. The actions that we took at the last Board meeting we think will be sufficient to deal with the projection of about \$1 million. As I cautioned at the last meeting, the \$1 million we projected as \$1.5 million but we thought that if we did some management types of things at Welfare we could probably get it down to \$1 million. The thing we will be closely monitoring in January and February is volume. If the recession deepens and you get more people on Welfare, then we may have to revisit that but overall it is the same pattern and I think we just have to work through a couple of more months here and see where that is. With respect to the revenues, interest income, the rates are the lowest they have ever been. The Fed lowered the interest rate on federal funds another $\frac{1}{4}$ of a point today so although we may have more cash than we have had in the past, we have the lowest rates we have ever seen in our lifetimes to invest at. Again, maybe that will turn around in the second part of the year but like any business cycle what usually happens is when you see your interest earnings are down, we are seeing interest and penalties on delinquencies and things like that are going up and offsetting that. Auto registrations still seems to be holding its own and some of the things in the Clerk's Office with respect to cable are better than expected. Right now we see a lot of that stuff offsetting each other. The only question we will have will be with respect to parking. It looks like revenues are projected to be sufficient to meet our commitment to the arena. How much we have in excess of that will be a deciding factor. Right now, the business plan that

we have in place with the cuts that we recommended at the last meeting we think are the right path and we would ask that you stick to that approach.

Alderman Lopez asked do we have \$60,000 left in contingency then. We took \$120,000 out of there?

Mr. Clougherty answered right.

Alderman Lopez asked what do we have left in civic contributions. Do you know?

Mr. Clougherty answered I think we cleaned out civic contributions entirely with the exception of the amount that had to be used for the animal shelter.

Alderman Lopez stated you mentioned that the parking is going to take care of the civic center. In reviewing some of the notes, if they are short \$700,000 or \$800,000, I understand that that can come out of the rainy day fund as far as revenues are concerned. Is that correct? I wanted to point out that we did say we would not use any money for the civic center right so we have to watch that very closely as far as going into the rainy day fund to help the civic center.

Mr. Clougherty replied I don't think you will need to help out the civic center. Two points. One, in terms of the parking fees those will be, I think, adequate to meet our payments to cover the civic center. That is your contractual obligation and I think it will be met. I don't think you are talking about having to use the reserve that is set-up in the civic center to deal with that. What will happen is you will not have an amount equal to what the projection was for revenue. If you remember at the time the budget was done our position was that those forecasts were high, but there were some that didn't believe we were flirting with a recession and other things and some of the revenues got jacked up over our objection. That being said, we can take a look at the additional revenues that we thought we would come in with for parking but that is not going to be related to our commitment to the civic center. Now if there are additional police and fire services or things like that, I would argue that as we have said right along the increased valuation that the City enjoyed as part of the budget process is in no small part, I think, attributable to the civic center and that offsets the parking too. I think there are a number of factors at play there and with the civic center you have to take a long view. There are going to be years when you take dollars in as a result of the values going up for the businesses on Elm Street. That is not direct cash, but certainly an impact that offsets from a budgetary standpoint. I think all of those things come into play when you open up that discussion, Alderman, and we will be happy to talk about that at some point if we need to. It really doesn't

play in directly to our plan that we put in place for the Welfare issue, which is our overriding concern with the financials right now.

On motion of Alderman Pinard, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted to receive and file.

Chairman Hirschmann addressed item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from Sharon Wickens, Financial Analyst II, submitting reports as follows:

- a) department legend;
- b) open invoice report over 90 days by fund;
- c) open invoice report (all invoices for interdepartmental billings only);
- d) open invoice report (all invoices due from the School Dept. only); and
- e) customer comments report – customers meeting over 90-day criteria.

Ms. Wickens stated these are just the standard reports that I give you every month. I am not submitting write-offs or anything like that. These are just informational.

Alderman Thibault asked is the list of School Department open invoices something that the City is now accepting that we will pay as a course of action constantly or is it something that the School doesn't feel they can pay this year.

Ms. Wickens replied you are looking at what the School Department owes us.

Mr. Clougherty stated I believe these are chargebacks that are owed from FY00 and you will recall that in the settlement agreement it said that they had 60 days from the adoption of the agreement to pay them off, which I think brings them to December 13 or 16. It is my understanding that when they have their next committee meeting over there that they will be passing something to pay for this. We just talked to Joanne in our office to take care of that. We shouldn't see those at the next meeting.

Ms. Wickens stated well some of them are actually FY01 and they are still working that out, but this is basically reimbursement back and they are working out the details.

Alderman Thibault replied we are talking \$1 million and that is a lot of money. So by next month a lot of this will be gone?

Ms. Wickens responded yes.

Alderman Lopez asked on Page 4 in reference to the Riverfront Foundation. They owe us \$58,000 from 1998. Now I would think that after three years we forget it. What are we going to do on all of these 1998 bills?

Ms. Wickens answered it is not 1998, it is June 1, 2001.

Alderman Lopez replied you are right but what are we doing to collect from the Riverfront Foundation.

Mr. Clougherty responded they pay it at the end of the year because it is based on the terms of their agreement with Merchant Motors who pay for their naming rights. I believe they get that money in May or June.

Alderman Thibault asked isn't that something that we agreed upon a few months ago.

Mr. Clougherty answered that is the way it has always been. They pretty much pick up the cost of that over time and what happens is their naming rights aren't quite enough to cover everything so they take a little bit from one year and then there is a little layover and they make it up in the next year. Eventually, the naming rights dollars will be in excess of the debt service and it will swing the other way.

Alderman Lopez stated on Page 18, I called Sharon and asked her...did you find out in reference to the drop off center what type of policy they have for those individuals who do not pay and keep dropping stuff off.

Ms. Wickens replied actually I did and I asked somebody from Highway to come in and talk to you about delinquent customers and what the procedures are.

Mr. Clougherty stated I would point out that our experience with the Highway Department is they are among the more aggressive with respect to going after some of these. Sharon talked to Don Pinard from Highway who is their business officer and told him that it might be helpful if he were here tonight to explain to you what they did. If you want to take a few minutes, he is available and we could do that.

Chairman Hirschmann stated everyone who drops off at the facility has a medallion that goes on their windshield. My is, I believe, 301, and you drive on to the scale and they read your medallion and it goes onto their computer and they can see your name and activities and whether or not you paid. I would think that if you haven't paid, they wouldn't allow you to drop off there anymore. I don't know if that is actually a policy, but it is computerized.

Mr. Don Pinard stated you have a couple of different kinds of customers that come in. You have people who are cash customers who don't use the facility too often. Basically these are just residents that will go there maybe once a month or a couple of times a year. They also have a sticker that they put on their vehicle, identified by the registration and a driver's license. What happens is those are cash customers and they drive over the scales as Mr. Hirschmann said. They drop their stuff off and drive back on the scale and the difference is what they pay for. In some cases, they don't have the money so what we do at that point is we turn around and invoice them. If we can't get the invoice from them within the 30 days, they get a letter saying that they are in arrears. We basically at that point, depending on how much it is, will shut them off. We make contact with the drop off facility and tell them that these people haven't paid and can't drop off anymore. Then you have your charge customers that are more like your constructions businesses who go in very regularly. They have to be set-up as a charge customer. The set-up is basically the same except we bill them once a month. The same thing happens with them if they go into arrears. We end up sending them letters. After 90 days, we send them to a collection agency but they are normally shut off. What happens is some of these businesses are very crafty and they will get more than one vehicle under a different name. You have this gentleman, Mr. Cate, who you see appear on this list. He had one for himself and one for his wife under a different name. Those type of situations happen. Out of those that are 90 days over, he makes up over half. He has been shut off. He came in last month trying to get back in saying I will pay cash and we told him absolutely not. We wanted to get \$500. We told him if he paid that then he could be put back on a cash basis and we would see how things go. He never got back to us and paid us off. He said he was in jail and this and that and he didn't have the \$500 and the only way he could come up with it was to be able to work and by working he would have to dump stuff. I believe his account has been sent to the City Solicitor.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated I am presently attempting to collect that one but as has been pointed out, his ability to pay may be somewhat questionable.

Alderman Thibault stated that is a good point that you bring up because what happens at that point is that these contractors go out in rural areas like I have in my ward and dump the stuff and we end up having to go pick it up anyway for

nothing. As a matter of fact just this week again I called Highway to go down to Douglas Street and pick up all of the debris that was thrown out there. People go out there at 11:30 PM or midnight and throw stuff on the side of the road and we end up having to pick it up anyway. What are we saving here and what are we doing here? I don't know if there is a way around it, but there has to be a way...how about if they pay in advance or when they go to the scale?

Mr. Pinard replied the tough part is that you don't know how much they have to pay once they get there. You can ask them for some money in advance, I guess, or a deposit of some type. That has really never been looked at. The amount of money that we are talking normally...out of the \$1.7 million in total revenues, you are talking \$2,600 which is a very small amount. He makes up most of it, almost \$1,000 and then we have a few other individuals, employees on worker's compensation that owe us money that make up a lot of the rest.

Alderman Thibault asked do you understand what I am saying.

Mr. Pinard answered yes.

Alderman Thibault stated they end up throwing it out in rural areas like I have and I am sure Alderman Hirschmann gets some of that too. Then we end up having to go pick it up anyway. We get people upset because some people just throw their stuff anywhere whereas other people have to pay to get rid of it. It seems to me that there has to be a way that we can track that so nobody gets away with it.

Mr. Pinard replied for the volume that we do I don't think you see that many people who aren't paying their bills.

Chairman Hirschmann stated you are on top of it, Don, and I am pleased with what you are doing. What I would encourage the next Board to do is please not write this money off. If someone bounces a check, hold their feet to the fire. We have a Solicitor who can chase them through the Police Department.

Alderman Lopez stated you can make them pay cash and if you have somebody who violates it you can have them bring a check and have them fill it in or you don't have to take their stuff correct. If I come and I am one of the guys who didn't pay before, do you let me go through or do I have to pay cash or go get a check?

Mr. Pinard replied it depends on how much you owe us.

Alderman Lopez asked even if they owe you \$20, somebody should be paying.

Mr. Pinard answered if they owe us \$20, we are looking to collect \$20 when they get there before they dump their load. We are definitely looking for that cash up front if they are a cash customer. If they are a habitual offender and an accounts payable customer, then we would probably tell them that they have to pay cash from that point on. As far as the situation with illegal dumping, I can talk to Superintendent Neveu to find out how much of that stuff is going on.

Alderman Lopez replied there is a lot of that going on. As a side note, over behind Grand Slam Pizza in my area, they dump there every night. They are filling in the swamp.

Chairman Hirschmann asked on page 4 of 4b, I picked up State of NH Treasurer Room and Meals money, January 6 bill for \$454,000. Why haven't we paid that?

Mr. Clougherty answered the \$454,000 is the amount of money that we get every year. When we get the rooms and meals tax money, we have always had \$454,000 in the City budget from wherever. When we get the payment, which becomes in December I believe, it wipes that out. We enter that in the beginning of the year.

Chairman Hirschmann stated there are only two weeks left in the year though and we didn't get paid yet.

Mr. Clougherty replied I think the check is cut on December 15. It comes in usually December 16 or 17.

Chairman Hirschmann stated I am looking at a 90-day report and for common sense if they are not going to pay us every year until December 15 why don't we bill them November 15. Every year they are going to end up on the 90-day report. This is common sense.

Mr. Clougherty replied that is a good point. It is an accrual that we put in at the end of the year.

Chairman Hirschmann asked so this is nothing to worry about. It is just a normal occurrence?

Mr. Clougherty answered yes.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to accept the reports as presented.

Chairman Hirschmann addressed item 5 of the agenda:

Copies of communications to Dona Blais, Fire Department Administrative Assistant, relative to requests to waive false alarm fees as follows:

- a) Robert Duperron, Duperron Enterprises;
- b) Brooks McQuade, McQuades, Inc.;
- c) Fred Keefe; and
- d) Richard Leclerc, Building Manager, CD Richard Ellis
Whittier Partners

Mr. Clougherty stated as you know we give you a report that shows things that are outstanding and it gets to a point where the departments are trying to collect against certain items. The individuals listed a-d are people who feel that they have a legitimate complaint in terms of their billing. They don't feel that their billing was justified and in effect that the bill should be written off. Now the Finance Department doesn't have that ability, which is an internal control because you don't want your departments writing that stuff off, only the Aldermen have the ability to do that. The thought was that the only appeal really is to the Committee on Accounts to deal with this. These people really are appealing their billing from the Fire Department to see if they can be waived. I believe that Mr. Duperron is here. The other individuals would like to come to a subsequent meeting if that is appropriate. I don't think we have any formal procedure for dealing with this. I might defer to the Solicitor as to how we want to handle that or if we want to write up a procedure.

Alderman Thibault asked, Kevin, do the departments that are affected concur with the fact that these should be written off.

Mr. Clougherty replied I can't speak to that. You would have to deal with each one of them.

Alderman Thibault stated if a department feels that they are justified in getting recourse, we should be made aware of that and we probably could dispense with that. If we knew that the department said we were wrong and billed them in error, then we could take care of that also.

Chairman Hirschmann asked, Mr. Arnold, I was a member of the Fire Department Fee and Charge Review Committee and I was not aware that we were disbanding. Reading this letter, Dona Blais from the Fire Department says that the committee is disbanding. We used to meet on an irregular basis to discuss fire alarms. Her letter says, "On May 31, 2000 you requested that the Fire Department Alarm Calls to your building be reviewed to determine if the \$1,150,000 fee for calls made in 1999 could be waived or reduced. Due to revisions to the Manchester Charter, our Manchester Fire Department Review Committee was eliminated."

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated I would have to get back to you with an answer. I was looking through the Ordinances and I don't see anything.

Chairman Hirschmann replied my other question is if that committee is disbanded, does this Committee have the right to deliberate on these fees. Can you give us any advice?

Deputy Solicitor Arnold responded if that committee is disbanded then Mr. Clougherty is right that basically this Committee would recommend write-offs to the full Board.

Chairman Hirschmann asked so we can take testimony from Mr. Duperron, deliberate on it and recommend to the full Board what to do.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered yes.

Chairman Hirschmann asked does everyone agree on that because the fee committee has apparently disbanded so if Mr. Duperron or someone wants to plead their case they would do so with this Committee.

Alderman Levasseur moved to waive the fee entirely.

Alderman Thibault stated I wouldn't mind making a second to that motion except I would like to see the departments come up and answer this Committee as to whether we should waive the fees or not. If the department came up and said we erroneously billed these people or whatever that is fine but this Committee should know what is going on here.

Chairman Hirschmann stated we will allow Chief Kane to come up and give us some insight.

Alderman Lopez stated I have a question for the Solicitor. In reference to 92.26 for false alarm charges as indicated here, do we have a right to waive an ordinance?

Chairman Hirschmann stated while they are looking that up, with regard to Mr. Duperron's property on Brennan Street, this is from 1999. Have things gotten better since then?

Chief Kane replied in regards to that particular incident, there was an individual at that property who over the course of several months kept pulling the alarm and

there was an effort on the part of the Fire Department and Police Department and building owner to in fact apprehend the individual who was pulling the alarm.

Chairman Hirschmann asked so there was a collaborative effort.

Chief Kane answered there was an effort there to do that. If I may explain how we got here, as you are aware we had a false alarm review board that you were on. That board was made up similar to a board that you are still on with the police department so there were two boards, one for the Fire Department and one for the Police Department. We don't really have a lot of activity in this area but when we started having some activity here and as you can see it is not a lot, we tried to go to the board and we looked at it and we also looked at the board and said who authorizes this board to dispense with the paying of the money. If you look at the Police Department, they are authorized by the full Board under City ordinance to waive the fee. The Fire Department took it's authorization through the Commission. Once the Commission was restructured, that authority went away and along with that, the false alarm board went away. Since that point in time, we try to piggyback on with the Police Department's board because I don't believe there is a lot of activity there either. It seemed there would be a match between the Fire and Police Department and we could do it all at once. We are not authorized to do that and the only place that we could go with this is here.

Alderman Lopez asked, Chief, do you think these people should pay it like everybody else.

Chief Kane answered I am afraid that if we start waiving fees for false alarms this may progress because we sometimes have the same type of thing in schools and we sometimes have the same thing in dormitories where college kids live and if we say we are going to start waiving fees for one institution as opposed to doing it for all of them, I would have some concerns there. Certainly an individual who has worked with the Fire Department before, I don't really have a lot of history with regards to what has been done in the past and maybe some of you do.

Alderman Lopez replied just to follow-up if we were to waive this do you think that owners of these buildings might be lax and you will have more false alarms.

Chief Kane responded each building has a separate owner and I would hate to put them all in the same group. I know that there are some owners that are very concerned in regards to these types of activities and some owners may not be. I think the reason why we have that in place is to put the onus on the owners to pay attention.

Chairman Hirschmann stated, Chief, normally I agree with you. I don't want to write things off but we are talking about justice. This sounds like some mentally disturbed person who was creating a criminal act. The property owner basically became a victim. It is kind of like if an arsonist was running around torching buildings and the owner of the building is responsible but he didn't do it. This guy is in the same predicament. He is being fined for something that he even tried to intercede and control. He worked with you. I think we have to work with him. I don't know out of \$1,150 what would be fair but I think we should show...that is what the Committee was established for at the beginning – to have justice and make sure that people weren't punished. This seems like a punishment for this individual.

Alderman Lopez stated this happened in 1999. I just wonder why it took so long for the owner not to pay.

Chief Kane replied they weren't billed right away. What we usually do is wait until the end of the year so we wouldn't have billed in 1999 because it is not billed every single time this occurred. It is billed on a multiple basis. If you have one false alarm you are not going to be billed. It only starts after you have multiple alarms so we wait basically 12 months out before we take a look at it and bill it at that time.

Alderman Lopez asked has the owner contacted you in the last two years to tell you he is not paying. Has he told anybody? Is the owner here?

Chief Kane answered he is here. Dona has had numerous conversations with the owner in regards to this. One of the things that we tried to work through the process in regards to where was the committee and why wasn't the committee there and since there wasn't a committee what was the process for this person to have a hearing. This is why we ended up here. We tried several different avenues and this was the only avenue. Neither I nor my Commission can waive these types of fees. The only people that can really do that are the Aldermen or someone they designate.

Chairman Hirschmann called Mr. Duperron forward.

Mr. Robert Duperron stated back when I got this bill I appealed it and this was my first opportunity to speak before a board. It is not that I withheld the money, I needed to speak to a board first to determine whether I had to pay the bill or not. We did make every effort...I don't know if you have a copy there of the letter that I sent with my appeal. We did make every effort to catch the person responsible. Once we did narrow it down we put the person under eviction and that takes another three months and in the meantime they kept pulling the alarms. We did

have someone see the person pulling the alarm but we were told by the Fire Department that you have to have at least two witnesses before that person can be arrested. After we found out who it was, we started eviction proceedings. On the way out, when the person was finally being thrown out, they pulled the fire alarm for a final time so then we were sure that was the person responsible. In the last two years we only had a total of six alarms, which is cut down tremendously from what we had in 1999. We have made efforts. We had a public kitchen with a stove. We removed the stove so that there would be no more burning of pizzas in the oven and things of that nature. We did try to work with the Fire Department and we did contact them. The Fire Department contacted the Police Department and we couldn't think of anything else to do. That is about all I have to say.

Alderman Pinard asked after 1999 were you billed for 2000 and 2001.

Mr. Duperron replied in 25 years of business I have never been billed for false alarms. This was the only year that I had been billed for false alarms.

Alderman Pinard asked, Chief Kane, what is your answer to that. How come he wasn't billed for 2000 or 2001.

Chief Kane answered he didn't have any false alarms.

Chairman Hirschmann stated where the Fire Department did have to roll and go there 14 times and put people's lives at risk and the Fire Department did have to do some work, would you be amenable to accepting paying us \$250 to settle this.

Mr. Duperron replied that would be agreeable.

Chairman Hirschmann asked can I get a motion to do that. That way the City does recoup some trips and you go away happy.

Mr. Duperron replied that is fair and I would be agreeable to that.

On motion of Alderman Levasseur, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted to recommend to the full Board that the false alarm fee for Duperron Enterprises be reduced to \$250.00.

Chairman Hirschmann asked is Brooks McQuade here.

Mr. Clougherty answered the other individuals won't be here tonight. I believe they are available for a meeting next month.

Alderman Lopez moved to deny the other false alarm appeals.

Chairman Hirschmann stated we could table the rest until the individuals are available.

On motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman Levasseur, it was voted to table items b through d and invite the individuals to appear at the next meeting.

Mr. Clougherty stated I just want to clarify this list. The action by this Committee gets referred to the full Board. I think it is the full Board that has to approve it.

TABLED ITEM

6. Communication from Kevin Sheppard, Deputy Public Works Director, regarding the Johns Manville Settlement Fund.

This item remained on the table.

NEW BUSINESS

Alderman Levasseur stated Mr. Clougherty I think this Committee about a month ago asked for an audit of the Welfare Department. How is that proceeding?

Mr. Clougherty replied the auditor is and has been in there for the last two weeks. He is in the process of doing his research and gathering materials. The people there have been very cooperative. We have yet to make contact with the Commissioner, but the individuals who are there we have had a great response from.

Alderman Levasseur asked will you have some sort of a completed audit before the January Board comes in.

Mr. Clougherty answered I don't think so. I think Kevin's projection at the last meeting was it would take him at least 60 days to do that. I will have to go back and check that. I thought it was going to take longer than a month. I thought he might have some preliminary results.

Alderman Levasseur moved to have the audit sent to members of the Committee who will be leaving. It was ordered under this Committee and I would like to make sure that I get a copy.

Alderman Thibault stated if you asked the City Clerk's Office, I think you could get that.

Alderman Levasseur replied well I don't know when it is going to come. I would just like to have it sent to me. Kevin, I want to bring up a couple of points on why I think it is very important that this audit be done very thoroughly and probably go a little bit further than your average audit. A couple of reasons are that I have been told by pretty good sources that there will be a lawsuit against the City of Manchester for the Mayor's handling of the incident where Susan Lafond was locked out of her office. I want to be sure that if we are going to be going to court for a lawsuit that a couple of things are looked at in specificity. Mismanagement of funds. I want to make sure that he goes thoroughly through that but I also want to make sure that the expenditures in this past year are legitimate expenditures. In other words, I would like to make sure that there is a comparison to the prior year. While he is doing his audit, I think that now is the time that he should be making sure that he does everything to protect us from what I perceive is going to be a lawsuit within the next couple of weeks that will be handed down. What I am hearing is that the lawsuit will be brought and that Susan Lafond was incapable of proceeding with her work because there is an understanding that she may have been clinically depressed.

Alderman Lopez asked, Tom, are we walking on thin ground here with the comments that he is making. These are comments that could be used for public record. Would you rule on that?

Deputy Solicitor Arnold replied it is a tough question to answer. I think obviously if there is going to be litigation we probably would want to be very careful about what we say. I am certainly not going to say that he can't make any comment but if comments are made that could be used against the City, I would certainly advise against that.

Alderman Levasseur stated Kevin I worry a little bit about the perception out there that unemployment has increased and we have had more Welfare coming on to the roles in that department. I am looking at the last six terms prior to this term and there was never a deficit. There were times obviously Mr. Clougherty in your own experience I am sure when unemployment was much higher than it has been in the last year and recessions were a lot longer and I am sure the roles were much higher than they were in this past year. I am looking to make sure and I am saying this because I want to caution this Board against what may possibly happen in the next month or so. I would like this audit to be very thorough compared to other years to make sure that if a lawsuit happens and discovery is going to come and you are going to have all of these lawyers coming in from all over the place so you guys have an advantage right now to be able to get all of your numbers as clear as possible and any statements that are made to an incoming Board as far as that

audit goes, again, will be used against the City in an upcoming lawsuit. What I am doing is warning everybody here about that. That is it.

Mr. Clougherty stated this is the last meeting of the Committee on Accounts and we may have a different Committee next month and I would like to say on behalf of my staff and myself this Committee has been great to work with and we really appreciate all of your help over the years and your support and wish you all the best of luck and a happy holiday. I would like to acknowledge that this has been a great Committee to work with and hopefully we will see some of you back.

There being no further business to come before the committee, on motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee